

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 07410 01 OF 03 241919Z

42

ACTION EA-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 DODE-00 EB-07 NSAE-00 TRSE-00 ERDA-05

CIAE-00 COME-00 EUR-12 MC-02 ACDA-05 /042 W

----- 077225

R 241912Z MAR 75

FM USMISSION OECD PARIS

TO SECSTATE WASH DC 6172

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 03 OECD PARIS 07410

EXCON

E.O. 11652: XGDS1

TAGS: ESTC, COCOM

SUBJECT: COCOM LIST REVIEW - IL 1460 - AIRCRAFT AND  
HELICOPTERS

REFS: A. COCOM DOC REV(74) 1460/1 AND 2

B. STATE 57401

SUMMARY: IN DISCUSSION ON MARCH 17, ALL DELEGATIONS EXCEPT THE US, WHICH CONTINUED ITS RESERVE FROM ROUND 1, APPROVED A BRITISH PROPOSAL (A) TO RAISE FROM 5,000 TO 6,500 LBS. THE THRUST PARAMETER EMBARGOING JET AIRCRAFT ENGINES, AND (B) TO DISEMBARGO CIVIL JET ENGINES WHICH HAVE BEEN IN ACTUAL CIVILIAN SERVICE FOR MORE THAN 7 YEARS. PRESSURE WAS DIRECTED AT THE US TO EXPLAIN ITS INABILITY TO TAKE A POSITION OR EXPLAIN ITS VIEW ON THE PROPOSAL THROUGH TWO ROUNDS OF THE LIST REVIEW. ACTION REQUESTED: PREPARATION OF A US POSITION CONCURRING IN THE VIEWS OF THE MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS OR DOCUMENTING THE SPECIFIC REASONS WHY THOSE VIEWS ARE UNACCEPTABLE TO THE US. END SUMMARY.

1. THE US WAS CALLED UPON FIRST IN MARCH 17 DISCUSSION AS THE ONLY COUNTRY IN RESERVE ON THE BRITISH PROPOSAL TO RAISE THE 5,000 LB. THRUST LIMIT ON JET ENGINES UNDER (C) (II) TO 6,500 LBS. WHEN THE US RESERVE WAS MAIN-  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 07410 01 OF 03 241919Z

TAINED, THE UK DELEGATION PRESSED THE US FOR INDICATIONS

OF ITS THINKING. THE US DEL INDICATED THAT PROTECTION OF TECHNOLOGY FOR ALL ENGINES IS AN IMPORTANT FACTOR IN US CONSIDERATION OF THIS ITEM. THE UK ASKED WHETHER THE US HAS PROBLEMS WITH TECHNOLOGY DISTINCTIONS RELATED TO THE 1,500 LB THRUST DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THAT FOR 5,000LB. THRUST ENGINES WHICH IS NOT COVERED AND THEIR PROPOSED 6,500 LB. FIGURE. US DEL SUGGESTED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES APPARENTLY WERE EXAMINING WHETHER MOVING UP TO 6,500 LBS. WOULD MOVE THE CONTROL TO A TECHNOLOGICAL LEVEL OF GREATER COMMONALITY WITH HIGHER THRUST ENGINES AND WERE LOOKING AT SMALLER ENGINES FROM THAT VIEWPOINT AS WELL. THE UK CONCLUDED WITH A REQUEST THAT THE US TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE STATISTICS SUBMITTED IN ROUND I ON THE NUMBER OF ENGINES AT MUCH HIGHER THRUSTS WHICH WERE PRODUCED IN THE BLOC.

2. ALL THE OTHER PC'S ACCEPTED THE AMENDED UK PROPOSAL TO ADD A NEW SUBITEM (C) (V) EXCLUDING ENGINES WHICH HAVE BEEN IN CIVILIAN SERVICE FOR NOT LESS THAN SEVEN YEARS. US QUESTIONED THE MEANING OF "NEW ENGINE TECHNOLOGY" AS USED BY THE UK IN ITS EXPLANATORY NOTE. THE UK EXPERT STATED THAT THE PHRASE S INTENDED TO COVER ENGINE DESIGN FEATURES. A SIMPLE CHANGE IN SIZE OR AIRFLOW, FOR EXAMPLE, WOULD NOT REPRESENT NEW TECHNOLOGY, BUT THE USE OF NEW ALLOYS OR MANUFACTURING PROCESSES MENTIONED BY US EXPERT WOULD CONSTITUTE "NEW TECHNOLOGY".

3. THE US DEL RESERVED ON THE UK PROPOSAL TO ADD (C) (V) AND RECORDED US AGREEMENT WITH THE FRENCH INTERPRETATION OF INIO CONTAINED IN PARA 20 OF REF. A.

4. THE UK DEL OBSERVED THAT IN DICUSING (C) (II) THE US HAD SEEMED TO HIM TO BE IMPLYING THAT ENGINE THRUST MIGHT BE INADEQUATE IN SOME RESPECT, BUT IN DISCUSSING (C) (V) THE US SEEMED TO BE IMPLYING THE DESIRE FOR SOME CUTOFF SUCH AS ENGINE THRUST. THE US EXPLAINED THAT IT HAD BEEN SEEKING INFORMATION ON HOW THE UK NOTE WOULD WORK IN PRACTICE AND NOT TRYING TO INTRODUCE SPECIFIC LIMITS. THE UK NOTED THAT THEY HAD CONSCIOUSLY REJECTED THRUST LIMITATIONS BECAUSE IT IS POSSIBLE TO INCREASE

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 OECD P 07410 01 OF 03 241919Z

THRUST WITHOUT INTRODUCING NEW DESIGNS.

5. THE UK ASKED WHETHER THE US COULD AGREE WITH THE BASIC UK ASSUMPTION THAT AN OLD ENGINE SHOULD NOT BE CONTROLLED. HE NOTED THAT WHEN MOD HAD BEEN ASKED HOW OLD IS "OLD", THE ANSWER HAD BEEN "5 YEARS", BUT THE UK

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 07410 02 OF 03 241923Z

63

ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 TRSE-00 ERDA-05

CIAE-00 COME-00 EA-06 MC-02 ACDA-05 /038 W

----- 077291

R 241912Z MAR 75

FM USMISSION OECD PARIS

TO SECSTATE WASH DC 6173

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 02 OF 03 OECD PARIS 07410

WERE PROPOSING 7 YEARS, AND HE BELIEVED THAT COCOM SHOULD BE JUBILANT IF THE COMMUNIST COUNTRIES MIGHT WISH TO MANUFACTURE OLD ENGINES. HE CONTINUED RHETORICALLY, TO ASK WHETHER THE US IS SAYING THAT WE IN COCOM CAN MAINTAIN A TECHNICAL LEAD OF TEN TO 12 YEARS AND THAT THERE WILL BE A STRATEGIC ADVANTAGE IN DOING SO.

6. IN REPLY THROUGHOUT THE DISCUSSION US WENT OFF THE RECORD TO EXPAND ON THE TECHNOLOGY THEME IN PARA 3 REF. B AND ATTEMPTED TO DRAW OUT OTHER DELS ON THE SUBJECT. THE UK DISAGREED THAT THE GAP OF THE COMMUNIST COUNTRIES IS AS WIDE AS THE US HAD PORTRAYED IT. NOTING THAT THE US HAD NOT BEEN WILLING TO PROVIDE A POSITION THROUGH TWO ROUNDS, THE UK DEL EXPRESSED BELIEF THAT IT WOULD MAKE MORE SENSE FOR THE US TO WORK OUT ITS PROBLEMS WITH THE COMMITTEE IN DEBATE INSTEAD OF DAY AFTER DAY SAYING IT HAD NO POSITION TO PRESENT.

7. ANALYSIS: (A) THE NETHERLANDS DEL PASSED A NOTE TO THE US DEL POINTING OUT THAT THE UK PROPOSAL WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF STRENGTHENING THE EXISTING COVERAGE BY CLOSING A POTENTIAL LOOPHOLE WHICH HE SUSPECTED THE FRENCH WERE ATTEMPTING TO OPEN BY THEIR INTERPOTATION IN PARAGRAPH 19 OF REF. A. NEEDLESS TO SAY, THE NETHERLANDS AND UK DELEGATIONS ARE DISPOSED TO SUSPECT EVERY STATEMENT BY THE FRENCH AS AN ATTEMPT TO OPEN A LOOPHOLD. WE DID NOT NECESSARILY SEE ANY MOTIVE IN THE FRENCH

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 07410 02 OF 03 241923Z

INTERPRETATION OTHER THAN DESIRE TO RESPOND TO A DIRECT QUESTION. (B) THE UNDERLYING THINKING OF THE UK IN PRESENTING NEW SUBITEM (C) (V) IS ITS BELIEF THAT THE CLOSING OF ANY TECHNOLOGY GAP BETWEEN THE WESTERN AND COMMUNIST COUNTRIES IN AERO ENGINES IS THE RESULT OF INTERNAL COMMUNIST PRIORITIES AND CHOICES. THEREFORE, SHOULD THE COMMUNIST COUNTRIES PERCEIVE A "GAP" TO BE BRIDGED THEY CAN AND WILL BRIDGE IT INDEPENDENTLY OF ANY WESTERN LEVERAGE OR EMBARGO. AS A COROLLARY, IN VIEW OF DEMONSTRATED CAPABILITY OF THE SOVIETS TO PRODUCE VERY LARGE NUMBERS OF THE LATEST MILITARY AIRCRAFT, THE BRITISH BELIEVE THAT THERE IS NO STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE IN EMBARGOING CIVIL ENGINES WHICH HAVE BEEN IN USE LONGER THAN 7 YEARS. SEPARATELY, MACCULLOUGH AND HAYNES OF THE UK TEAM POINTED OUT THAT RECENT APPRAISAL OF THE AERO TYPE ENGINES IN SOVIET HYDROFOILS INDICATES THAT THEY ARE OF A QUALITY AND RELIABILITY SUPERIOR TO ANY ENGINES WHICH CAN NOW BE PRODUCED IN THE FREE WORLD. (C) THE US DEL SOUGHT TO DRAW OUT OTHER DELEGATIONS ON THE QUESTION OF TECHNOLOGY RAISED PARA 3 REFTTEL. TO NO AVAIL. THE ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION IS OF COURSE CONTAINED IN THE FRENCH STATEMENT IN PARA 3 REF A AND THE UK QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS IN PARAS 1 AND 2 ABOVE. IN COCOM TERMS, THE TECHNOLOGY FOR CIVIL JET ENGINES BELOW 5,000 LBS. THRUST IS NOT COVERED. NEVERTHELESS, IN ACTUAL PRACTICE NO COUNTRY PERMITS FREE TECHNOLOGY FOR AIRCRAFT ENGINES. AT THAT POINT THEY WOULD BE SCREENED FOR MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE AND AP-5 MUST NECESSARILY BE APPLIED ON A CASE BY CASE BASIS. IN THAT CASE, DESIGNS AND PROCESSES WOULD BE DETERMINING FACTORS RATHER THAN SIZE WHICH IS ONLY A QUESTION OF SCALING. DEL DID NOT FORMALLY OR DIRECTLY RAISE THE INTERPRETATIVE QUESTION BECAUSE THE RESPONSE OF THE OTHER PC'S WOULD HAVE BEEN HOSTILE GIVEN THE LONG COMMITTEE RECORD ON TREATMENT OF TECHNOLOGY QUESTIONS. IN THE PROCESS OF THAT DEBATE GREY AREA COVERAGE MIGHT WELL HAVE BEEN LOST RATHER THAN GAINED, AS APPEARS TO BE THE INTENT OF OUR IN-

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 07410 03 OF 03 241912Z

42

ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 TRSE-00 ERDA-05

CIAE-00 COME-00 EA-06 MC-02 ACDA-05 /038 W

----- 077216

R 241912Z MAR 75

FM USMISSION OECD PARIS

TO SECSTATE WASH DC 6174

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 3 OF 3 OECD PARIS 7410

STRUCTIONS.

8. ON BALANCE, ANY ATTEMPT TO COVER ENGINES HERETOFORE UNEMBARGOED WOULD BE A NON-STARTER UNLESS JUSTIFIED OBJECTIVELY AND ACCOMPANIED BY SUBSTANTIAL RELAXATION TRADE-OFFS. WASHINGTON AGENCIES SHOULD BE AWARE THAT, AS INDICATED IN THE OPENING STATEMENTS, ALL MEMBER COUNTRIES CONSIDER THE TIME RIPE FOR REDUCTING THE EMBARGOES TO A MINIMUM IN RESPONSE TO DETENTE AS WELL AS TO SEVERE PRESSURES TO INCREASE TRADE AS THEIR DOMESTIC ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES WORSEN. THEY HAVE SHOWN THEMSELVES UNIMPRESSED WITH POORLY SUPPORTED RECOMMENDATION FOR EMBARGO INCREASES, AND POSITIVELY RESENTFUL OF POSITIONS WE HAVE RECEIVED, REFLECT IGNORANCE OF THE RECORDS OF PREVIOUS COMMITTEE DEBATE AS WELL AS COCOM RULES AND PRINCIPLES.

9. ACTION REQUESTED: PREPARATION OF A US POSITION WHICH ACCEPTS THE UNANIMOUS DESIRES OF OTHER MEMBERS OR DOCUMENTS IN COCOM TERMS SPECIFIC US CONCERNS WHICH PREVENT OUR ACCEPTING THEIR VIEWS.

TURNER

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** AIRCRAFT, EXCEPTIONS LIST, IL 1460, HELICOPTERS, TRADE CONTROLS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 24 MAR 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GarlanWA  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975OECDP07410  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** X1  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750102-0792  
**From:** OECD PARIS  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750322/aaaaatnt.tel  
**Line Count:** 261  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION EA  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 75 COCOM DOC REV(71460/1  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GarlanWA  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 02 JUN 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** WITHDRAWN <19 MAY 2003 by GarlanWA, 3.4.X9>; RELEASED <02 JUN 2003 by GarlanWA>; APPROVED <02 JUN 2003 by GarlanWA>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** COCOM LIST REVIEW - IL 1460 - AIRCRAFT AND HELICOPTERS  
**TAGS:** ESTC, UK, COCOM  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006